

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/485,225	02/23/2000	XAVIER JOUBERT	061/088	1666
75	90 03/21/2002			
POLLOCK VANDE SANDE & PRIDDY			EXAMINER	
PO BOX 19088 WASHINGTON		20036 RODRIGUEZ, RUTH C		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	
			DATE MAIL ED: 02/21/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Advisory Action	09/485,225		JOUBERT ET AL.	
·	Examiner	Art Unit	1 12/	
	Ruth C Rodriguez	3626	121	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	on appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence a	ddress	
THE REPLY FILED 05 March 2002 FAILS TO PL Therefore, further action by the applicant is require final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eit condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	ed to avoid abandonment of this ther: (1) a timely filed amendmen Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper re nt which places the appli	eply to a cation in	
PERIOD F	OR REPLY [check either a) or b	o)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the ma b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date no event, however, will the statutory period for reply ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REF 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136 fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment.	e of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date y expire later than SIX MONTHS from the PLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH (a). The date on which the petition under period of extension and the correspondent date of the shortened statutory period of the Office later than three months after	ne mailing date of the final reje IS OF THE FINAL REJECTIO er 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the ap ding amount of the fee. The a for reply originally set in the fir	ection. N. See MPEP  ppropriate extension ppropriate extension al Office action; or	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on App 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be ent	ered because:			
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would requir	e further consideration and/or se	earch (see NOTE below)	);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see	Note below);			
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application</li><li>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	cation in better form for appeal b	y materially reducing or	simplifying the	
(d)  they present additional claims without	canceling a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected cla	ims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following	g rejection(s):			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s)     canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	_ would be allowable if submitted	d in a separate, timely file	ed amendment	
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ requapplication in condition for allowance because		n considered but does N	NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be consider raised by the Examiner in the final rejection		DLELY to issues which w	ere newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed ame explanation of how the new or amended classification.			ed and an	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as f	ollows:			
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected: 3,6-10 and 12.				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	<u></u> .			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on 0	5 March 2002 is a)⊠ approved	or b) disapproved b	y the Examiner.	

Anthony Knight
Supervise , Palent Examiner
Group 3800

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)





Continuation of 2. NOTE: The newly amended claim 12, does not overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tracy (US 4,559,677) in view of Einhorn (US 4,010,794) and Lacore et al. (US 5,546,639) because all the limitations mentioned in claim 12 are present in the aforementioned rejection. The only change required to perfect the rejection of the newly amended claim 12 is to reject the claim under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Einhorn in view of Tracy and Lacore et al.